

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-16 were pending in the application; rejected claims 3, 5 and 7 under the second paragraph of 35 USC § 112; rejected claims 1, 2, 8-12, 15 and 16 under 35 USC § 102(e); and rejected claims 3-7, 13 and 14 under 35 USC § 103(a). In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patents 6,839,878 to Icken et al.; 6,717,938 to D'Angelo; and 6,563,517 to Bhagwat et al. (References A-C, respectively) were cited. Claims 17 and 18 have been added and thus, claims 1-18 are pending. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Changes to Specification

The specification has been amended to correct a typographical error. It is submitted that no "new matter" has been added because one of ordinary skill in the art would have easily discovered the error and understood that the correct words were similar to the change that has been made.

Rejections under 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

In items 2-3 on page of the Office Action, claims 3, 5 and 7 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 USC § 112 due to use of the words "the PDF". These words have been changed to --a portable document format--. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

In items 5-9 on pages 2-6 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 8-12, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by Icken et al. In item 6, it was asserted that column 3, line 64 to column 4, line 2; column 4, lines 15-24; and Fig. 1 disclosed the accepting, transmitting and registering steps recited in claim 1. However, all that is described and illustrated in these portions of Icken et al. is storing "user specific types of authorities, such as being capable of only reading the author material, or editing the author material" (column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 1). The next paragraph of Icken et al. (which was not cited) indicates that geographical limitations may be specified regarding where the editing may be performed. The beginning of the paragraph at lines 15-37 of column 4 (which was cited) describes use of the access control structure table 16 in Fig. 1 to implement restrictions on reading and editing the content stored in data store 24. However, there is no suggestion in the cited portions of Icken et al. and no suggestion has been found anywhere else in Icken et al. regarding a "format of said provision

information to be applied to said recipient" (claim 1, line 6-7). There is no mention of how the content is formatted in the cited portions of Icken et al., only restrictions on what operations users can perform on the content.

With respect to the providing operation recited in claim 1, in addition to the text spanning columns 3 and 4, column 4, lines 58-66 was cited. This portion of Icken et al. describes the selection of "a subset of content 24a from the content data store 24 and a subset of display components 26a from the display component data store 26 based on resolved control structures conveyed by the access control engine 12", (column 4, lines 58-62). No explanation of what "subset of content 24a" represents has been found anywhere in Icken et al. It is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would assume that the subset 24a is the content selected by the user and authorized by the system for access by that user.

The word "format" does not appear in Icken et al. and no suggestion of providing content in more than one format has been found. Therefore, clearly Icken et al. does not anticipate claim 1 or any of the other independent claims, since they all recite "registered provision information corresponding to the registered provision format based on said received recipient information" (last two lines of claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12 and 16) or "a provision format of said provision information to be applied to said recipient" (claim 8, lines 4-5; claim 11, lines 5-6; and claim 15, lines 4-5). Furthermore, it is submitted that it will not be obvious to modify Icken et al. to restrict the format of information provided to users, because most systems, like what is apparently disclosed in Icken et al., store information to be supplied to users in only one format.

It is submitted that additional evidence of a prior art system restricting a user to a specific format of information that is provided to the users would be required in addition to what is disclosed in Icken et al. No suggestion of restricting access by format of information has been found in the applied art. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1, 2, 8-12, 15 and 16 patentably distinguish over the applied art.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

In items 10-12 on pages 6-7 of the Office Action, claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Icken et al. Since claim 3 depends from claim 2, it is submitted that claim 3 patentably distinguishes over Icken et al. for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 2.

In items 13-15 on pages 7-9 of the Office Action, claims 4, 5 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Icken et al. in view of the D'Angelo. Claims 4 and 5

depend from claim 2 and claim 13 depends from claim 12. As noted above, nothing has been found in D'Angelo suggesting modification of Icken et al. to include restrictions based on format. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 4, 5 and 13 patentably distinguish over the combination of Icken et al. and D'Angelo for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 2 and 12.

In items 16-18 on pages 9-12 of the Office Action, claims 6, 7 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Icken et al. in view of Bhagwat et al. Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 2 and claim 14 depends from claim 12. As noted above, nothing was cited or has been found in Bhagwat et al. suggesting modification of Icken et al. to restrict access by format of information provided to users. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 6, 7, and 14 patentably distinguish over Icken et al. in view of Bhagwat et al. for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 2 and 12.

New Claims

Claim 17 has been added to recite what is stored by a system according to the present invention and how it is supplied under what circumstances to users. Included in the information that is stored is "format information corresponding to the provision information and recipient information indicating in what format the provision information can be provided to each of the authorized recipients" (claim 17, lines 5-7), where "provision information [is] accessible by authorized recipients" (claim 17, lines 3-4) and "recipient information ... [indicates] what in the provision information each of the authorized recipients is authorized to receive" (claim 17, lines 4-5). Furthermore, what is transmitted to a "requesting terminal device ... [is] requested provision information in a registered provision format if the recipient information indicates that permission to access the requested provision information in the registered provision format has been granted to the recipient identifier" (claim 17, last four lines). For the reasons discussed above with respect to the original independent claims, it is submitted that claim 17 patentably distinguishes over the applied art.

Claim 18 provides additional details regarding how provision information is stored. In particular, "new provision information, authorized recipient information identifying at least one recipient who is authorized to receive the new provision information, and at least one indication of an authorized format in which the new provision information is to be provided to the at least one recipient" (claim 18, last four lines) is stored "if the provider name is authorized according to the recipient information" (claim 18, lines 4-5). Nothing was cited or has been found in the applied art suggesting that any "indication of an authorized format" is stored, or under what

circumstances information to be supplied to users is added to the stored content. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 18 further patentably distinguishes over the applied art.

Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-18 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 8/8/05

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501